



3 1761 05976751 7



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
University of Toronto

INTERNATIONAL
COURTS OF ARBITRATION

COMPLIMENTS

OF THE EDITOR



Thos Balch
Philadelphia

INTERNATIONAL COURTS OF ARBITRATION

BY

THOMAS BALCH

1874

SIXTH EDITION

EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND ADDITIONAL NOTES

BY

THOMAS WILLING BALCH

Member of the Council of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania
Member of the American Antiquarian Society of Worcester, Massachusetts
Corresponding Member of the Wyoming Historical and Geological
Society of Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, etc.

PHILADELPHIA
ALLEN, LANE AND SCOTT
1915

148734
24/2/19

INTRODUCTION.

[T will be fifty-one years in November of the present year since Thomas Balch proposed to President Lincoln, in November, 1864, to submit the *Alabama* claims for settlement to an International Court of Justice composed of three jurists. The following year, he addressed on March 31st, 1865, an open letter to Mr. Huntington at Paris, which was printed in the New York *Tribune* on May 13th, 1865. In that letter he formulated and made public his plan for an International Court, and gave cogent reasons why the difficulties then existing between the United States and Great Britain should be settled by such a Court instead of being allowed to involve ultimately, perhaps, the two Nations in war. That letter, thanks to James Lorimer and John Westlake, was reprinted March 15th, 1867, in England in *Social Science*, the bi-monthly publication of the Social Science Association; and of that

association at that time the Right Hon. Sir Stafford Northcote, Bart., M. P., one of the British negotiators of the Treaty of Washington in 1871, was a member. Mr. Balch's efforts to have the *Alabama* claims submitted to and decided upon legal grounds by an International Court of jurists formed one of the links that helped to maintain and preserve the peace that has extended through a century of time between two of the most powerful members of the family of Nations; and so it has seemed appropriate once more to publish this monograph on the 13th of May in this year of grace 1915.

Two years after the Geneva Tribunal handed down its decision, Mr. Balch wrote the present work. It first appeared in the *Law Magazine and Review*, of London, in November, 1874 (page 1026). The first separate edition of the book was printed that same year at the Riverside Press at Cambridge, Massachusetts, and was sent by the author to James Lorimer, John Westlake, William Beach Lawrence, Thomas Erskine Holland, Count Corti and many other influential publicists and leading jurists. And as this work was first printed in 1874, the year immediately following the year that saw the birth of the International Law Association with headquarters at London, and also of the Insti-

tute of International Law—with James Lorimer and John Westlake among its original members—at Ghent, it is not too much to say that this small book had an important influence upon the thoughts and the subsequent work of many jurists who have since labored for the development of the idea and contributed to strengthening the practice of resorting to International Tribunals to settle the differences between Nations upon a basis of *legal* justice.

Besides discussing in a magisterial spirit the usefulness and possibilities of settling difficulties arising between Nations by submitting such questions to International Tribunals, the author threw the weight of his influence, so far as possible, towards curtailing war through the development of the customs and rules of International Law. Thus, for instance, in this book, he cited with approval the decision of the Prussian Supreme Court, of which the famous jurist Heffter was a member, that every contract to introduce “contraband goods into a friendly State is contrary to law and morals.”

The present editor reprinted this book in 1896, 1899, 1912 and 1914. In 1896 he sent a copy to the Honorable Andrew Dickinson White, who three years later headed the United States Delegation to the First Hague Peace Conference. And when that

conference was about to convene, the Rev. Dr. Edward Everett Hale, of Boston, sent copies of the 1899 edition to each of the five American delegates at The Hague. The editor also sent at the same time copies of the book to Count Cassini, the Russian Ambassador in Washington, asking him to forward it to his Government, and to Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British Ambassador at Washington and the head of the British delegation to The Hague Peace Conference of 1899.

It may be pointed out that it took not a little courage to urge the submission of the *Alabama* claims in 1864 and 1865 to an International Court for solution, and to write in the spring of the latter year an open letter urging that manner of solving the question. In that respect there has been an immense change in public opinion in the course of half a century. To-day when so many publicists and jurisconsults in various lands are urging the substitution more and more of international justice for international war to settle the disputes between Nations, the advocacy of referring National claims to International Tribunals is neither a novelty nor thought to be little short of high treason as was the case fifty years ago. Surely, then, Thomas Balch is one of the spiritual ancestors of those who to-day

are striving to substitute as far as possible international justice for international war.

Mr. Balch's efforts to have the *Alabama* claims submitted to an International Tribunal have been recognized by a number of distinguished publicists and jurists. The first to make this recognition was Professor Lorimer of Edinburgh who in 1874, in the letter which will be found in the text of the book itself, gave Mr. Balch due credit for having made the original proposal that developed into the Geneva Tribunal. Then the Hon. James M. Beck, formerly a notable member of the Philadelphia Bar and to-day of the New York Bar, in an oration entitled *Ground Arms*, which he delivered on July 4th, 1893, in Independence Square, Philadelphia, said:¹ "A nobler and better course was suggested, and it is to a Philadelphian that the credit is due, and as usual such credit is conspicuously wanting. In March, 1865, Thomas Balch suggested by a public letter that the pending *Alabama* claims, which seemed incapable of adjustment, and were a

¹ James M. Beck. "*Ground Arms*;" *An Oration delivered at the celebration of the One hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, at the invitation of the Councils of the City of Philadelphia, in Independence Square, July 4th, 1893*: Philadelphia, 1893, page 16.

source of intense irritation between our country and England, should be decided by a court of arbitration to be composed of one representative of each country and three (*sic*) representatives to be appointed by foreign powers. One can appreciate the advance of public sentiment in the last quarter of a century when I state that Mr. Balch could not for a time persuade a newspaper to even publish his letter, until finally it found a place in the columns of the *New York Tribune*. Mr. Balch also submitted his idea to President Lincoln, who, however, rejected it on the ground that it savored too much of the millennium. Mr. Lincoln added, however, in his quaint way, that 'the idea was worth airing.' It was not until 1871 that the commissioners from England and the United States signed the treaty at Washington, by which they agreed to submit their cause of quarrel to an international court of arbitration. The appointment of said court, their meeting at Geneva, their subsequent award in favor of the United States, and the total submission to it of Great Britain, constitute a milestone in the march of human progress."

Five years later, in June, 1898, Mr. Herbert Welsh of Philadelphia in his paper, *City and State*, twice paid notable tributes to Mr. Balch's efforts

in the *Alabama* claims case." On June 16th, he wrote: "Some of our readers have been surprised to learn from *City and State* something of the part which the late Thomas Balch played in regard to the arbitration of the *Alabama* claims. They did not know that the townsman of ours was at all concerned in bringing about a peaceful settlement of a great international difficulty. * * * To whom, then, could the citizens of Philadelphia—a city whose name is synonymous with brotherly love—more appropriately raise some permanent memorial than to their townsman, Thomas Balch, whose suggestions and efforts, at a most critical period in our history, led directly to an amicable instead of a bloody settlement of a quarrel between ours and the mother land?"

In an article in *The Record* of Leesburg, Loudon County, Virginia, on June 29th, 1906, Professor J. D. Rodeffer of Roanoke College, Virginia, gave Mr. Balch full credit for having originated the idea of submitting the *Alabama* claims to an International Court. Two years later, at a Peace Congress held in Horticultural Hall, Philadelphia, Mr. Franklin Spencer Edmonds, of the Philadelphia Bar, in opening the proceedings of the Con-

¹¹ *City and State*: Philadelphia, June 2nd and 16th, 1898.

gress, on Saturday evening, May 16th, 1908, after speaking of Penn's and Franklin's efforts for peace, spoke of Mr. Balch's proposal to refer the *Alabama* claims to an International Tribunal, and closed his address by saying: "It is then, to the city of Penn, of Franklin and of Balch, that we bid you welcome."ⁱⁱⁱ At the same time Mr. William Perrine, the editor of the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*, on Monday, May 18th, 1908, devoted his entire article on "Men and Things" to Mr. Balch's proposal of the Geneva Tribunal.^{iv} After giving Mr. Balch full credit for having planted the acorn which grew in eight years into the oak at Geneva, Mr. Perrine concluded his article by saying: "In a Peace Conference sitting in Philadelphia it would be eminently fit to-day that Balch's name should be honorably and gratefully recalled."

In 1909, the eminent Belgian publicist, Ernest Nys, a judge of the Court of Appeal of Brussels, wrote:^v "C'est lors des graves difficultés surgies entre les États-Unis et la Grande-Bretagne

ⁱⁱⁱ The *Record*: Philadelphia, May 17th, 1908.

^{iv} The *Evening Bulletin*: Philadelphia, May 18th, 1908.

^v Ernest Nys: *Les États-Unis et le Droit des Gens*: Brussels, 1909, pages 153-154; also *Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée*: Brussels, 1909, page 653.

durant la guerre de Sécession que Thomas Balch fit une courageuse et active propagande en faveur d'une solution pacifique; selon lui, le litige devait être déferé à trois jurisconsultes, chacune des parties choisissant un arbitre et les deux élus désignant le tiers arbitre.

"Le récit des efforts tentés et l'examen de la question de savoir si l'arbitrage permet de régler les différends internationaux font l'objet d'une monographie de Thomas Balch: *International Courts of Arbitration*.

"Cet homme de bien mourut, en 1877."

M. Paul Fauchille, the distinguished editor of the *Revue Générale de Droit International Public* of Paris, and a member of *l'Institut de Droit International*, wrote in 1913:^{vi}

"Il y a près de cinquante ans, au moment où se terminait aux États-Unis la guerre de Sécession, et alors que venait d'éclater un grave conflit entre les États-Unis et la Grande-Bretagne à propos de l'affaire de l'*Alabama*, M. Thomas Balch publiait dans la *New York Tribune* du 13 mai 1865 une lettre datée du 31 mars dans laquelle il émettait l'idée de recourir, pour trancher le conflit entre les

^{vi} *Revue Générale de Droit International Public*: Paris, 1913, page 747.

deux États, à une Cour d'arbitrage composée de juristes. C'est M. Thomas Balch qui fut ainsi le véritable initiateur du Tribunal de Genève dont la sentence du 14 septembre 1872 a marqué une date mémorable dans l'histoire du droit international."

Professor William I. Hull of Swarthmore said at the Lake Mohonk International Arbitration Conference in 1914:^{vii} "Who would have believed in 1864, when Mr. Thomas Balch, of Philadelphia, began to advocate the arbitration of the *Alabama* claims, that within eight years the Geneva Tribunal would have settled the ominous dispute by that apparently utopian means?"

Finally, Professor Lassa Oppenheim, the present holder of the Whewell chair of International Law in Cambridge University, who is truly one of the greatest living masters of the science of the Law of Nations in the world, stated in 1913 in his notable essay on the Panama Canal Tolls question^{viii} that Mr. Balch was "the first to demand the settlement of the *Alabama* dispute by arbitration." And again

^{vii} William I. Hull: *The Monroe Doctrine: National or International? The Problem and Its Solution*: New York and London, 1915, page 123.

^{viii} L. Oppenheim: *The Panama Canal Conflict between Great Britain and the United States of America*: Cambridge at the University Press, 1913, page 53.

on January 20th, 1915, in the *Cambridge Review*,^{ix} Oppenheim, after speaking of the interview in 1864 with Abraham Lincoln and the letter printed on May 13th, 1865, in the *Tribune*, said: "And, although it was at first derided, the idea gradually took root, and the Geneva Arbitration finally disposed of the conflict which for many years had threatened to lead to war between the two kindred Nations. * * * It is not going too far to say that Mr. Thomas Balch must be considered as the originator of the modern arbitration movement."

The author, Thomas Balch, was born at Leesburg, Loudon County, Virginia, July 23d, 1821, but belonged to a Maryland family. He was a grandson of the notable Rev. Dr. Stephen Bloomer Balch (Princeton, A. B., class of 1774, D. D. *honoris causa* 1818), of Georgetown, originally in the State of Maryland, but now a part of the city of Washington:—and a son of Judge Lewis P. W. Balch (Princeton, A. B. 1806, A. M. 1809, Judge United States District Court of West Virginia, 1865–68).^x He was descended from Colonel Ninian Beall, to whom Lord Baltimore made a grant in 1703 of the Rock

^{ix} *The Cambridge Review*, January 20th, 1915, page 142.

^x *General Catalogue of Princeton University, 1746–1906*: Princeton, 1908.

of Dumbarton upon which a large part of the city of Washington is now built. Among his ancestors, also, were Robert Brooke, and Colonel Thomas Brooke, the latter a member of the Provincial Council of Maryland, and both acting-Governors of that province, the former in 1652 and the latter in 1720.^{xi} Another of his forefathers was Sir Thomas Forster, a distinguished barrister of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, whom King James the First appointed on November 24th, 1607, judge of the Common Pleas, in which Court he sat until his death in May, 1612.^{xii} Thomas Sutton named Sir Thomas Forster one of the first governors of his hospital in London—The Charter House.^{xiii}

Mr. Balch entered Columbia College (now Columbia University) in the autumn of 1838 with the class of 1842, and studied there three years, when illness forced him to leave. At the end of his Freshman year, he received a silver medal for standing at the head of his class in geometry. His

^{xi} Thomas Willing Balch: *The Brooke Family of Whitechurch, Hampshire, England, together with an account of Acting-Governor Robert Brooke of Maryland and Colonel Ninian Beall of Maryland*: Philadelphia, 1899.

^{xii} Edward Foss: *The Judges of England*: London, 1857, Volume VI., page 157;—*The Brooke Family*, already cited, pages 6-7.

^{xiii} 10 Coke's *Reports*, 102.

classmate, Abram S. Hewitt, member of Congress and Mayor of New York, said that "Tom Balch was the master of English style in the class." He studied law with Stephen Cambreling and was admitted to the New York Bar in 1845; to the Philadelphia Bar in 1850; and on January 5th, 1855—upon motion of the Hon. Thomas Ewing of Indiana—Mr. Balch was admitted to practice at the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States over which his kinsman, Roger Brooke Taney, then presided as Chief Justice. Besides the present monograph, Mr. Balch wrote much on historic and economic subjects. In 1853 he was elected a member of the Council and Domestic Corresponding Secretary of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The same year he was one of the founders of the Seventy-Six Society, an association formed at Philadelphia for the publication of manuscripts and the re-printing of rare books relating to the period of the American Revolution; and of the four books published by the society, he was the editor of two: *The Examination of Joseph Galloway* (1855) and *Papers relating to the Maryland Line* (1857). In 1854 he was one of the founders of the Philadelphia Cricket Club, now the oldest cricket club in the United States. In 1855 he published *Letters*

and Papers relating chiefly to the Provincial History of Pennsylvania, a book better known as the "Shippen Papers." Another important work, *Les Français en Amérique*, was published at Paris in 1872. He was an honorary member of the American Whig Society of Princeton University, a member of the Société de Législation Comparée of Paris, and a corresponding member of the Virginia Historical Society. From 1859 to 1873 he lived in Europe, making an occasional trip home. In 1875 he was one of the founding members of the Rittenhouse Club of Philadelphia. Thomas Balch died at his home on Spruce Street in Philadelphia on March 29th, 1877.

In this sixth edition, as in the fourth and fifth editions, the editor has incorporated some changes in the phraseology that he found in the annotations in Mr. Balch's own copy, on which he had written "author's copy." The editor has added also notes 17 and 24 taken from the same source; the notes left by Mr. Balch of his interview in November, 1864, with President Lincoln; Mr. Huntington's communication of April 21st, 1865, on the death of Richard Cobden, to the *New York Tribune*; and a few other foot notes. Mr. Balch's original open letter upon the *Alabama* question will be found in the *New York Tribune* of

May 13th, 1865, on the fourth page and in the last column, under the title: "England and the United States."^{xiv} That letter is reprinted—at the suggestion of Professor John Bach McMaster, the historian—in facsimile from the *New York Tribune* in America of May 13th, 1865, and from *Social Science* in England of March 15th, 1867, and will be found facing respectively pages 14 and 16 of this edition as it faced pages 12 and 16 of the fourth edition printed in 1912.

Further it may be well to point out that Mr. Balch, in his letter to the *Tribune*, proposed that the *Alabama* claims should be submitted for solution to a Judicial Tribunal, not to a Board of Mediation; and that the case eventually was tried by a Judicial Court, not merely by a Board of Mediation. And in this connection it seems well worth while to quote one or two passages from the writings of the Hon. John Bassett Moore to explain the real meaning of the word *arbitration* when used by the publicists. That distinguished juriconsult, who is recognized the world over as a master authority upon the Law of Nations, in his monumental *Digest*, differentiates between *media-*

^{xiv} Thomas Willing Balch: *The Alabama Arbitration*, Philadelphia, 1900, pages 20, 40 *et seq.*

tion and arbitration as follows:^{xv} "These methods are often discussed as if they were practically the same, but in reality they are fundamentally different. Mediation is an advisory, arbitration is a judicial function. Mediation recommends, arbitration decides." Then a little further, after stating that mediation is a diplomatic function, he goes on to say: "Arbitration, on the contrary, represents a principle as yet only occasionally acted upon, namely, the application of law and of judicial methods to the determination of disputes between Nations. Its object is to displace war between Nations as a means of obtaining national redress, by the judgments of international judicial tribunals; just as private war between individuals, as a means of obtaining personal redress has, in consequence of the development of law and order in civilized states, been supplanted by the processes of municipal courts."^{xvi}

^{xv} John Bassett Moore: *Digest of International Law*: Washington, 1906, Volume VII., page 25. On this point see also the same author's *History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to which the United States has been a party*; Washington, 1898, Volume V., page 5042.

^{xvi} Concerning the difference between mediation and arbitration see what Professor Westlake says in the letter printed in the appendix of this book, on pages 63 and 64. See also Westlake's *International Law* (2nd edition), 1910, Part I., pages 305, 354.

Finally it is well to call attention to an explanatory extract from a letter of Professor Westlake to the present editor which will be found on page 17 in a foot-note, and to point out that that same extract was printed in the same place in the edition of 1912 during Professor Westlake's lifetime.

The notes added by the editor are enclosed in brackets and marked with his initials.

THOMAS WILLING BALCH,

Editor.

PHILADELPHIA, May 13th, 1915.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since the preceding introduction was set up in type, a conference to launch a League of Peace, with Ex-President Taft as President of the League, was held in the Old Pennsylvania State House, better known as Independence Hall, on June 17th, 1915. On the evening of Wednesday, June 16th, the conference was opened with a banquet at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, at which many eminent Philadelphians and distinguished judges, publicists and members of the Bar from other cities were present. At the banquet, the Hon. Rudolph Blankenburg, Mayor of Philadelphia, presided; and the speakers were Mr. Hamilton Holt,

editor of *The Independent*, of New York, Judge George Gray of Delaware, the Hon. Oscar S. Straus of New York, A. Lawrence Lowell, President of Harvard University, and Ex-President William Howard Taft. Mayor Blankenburg in his introductory remarks, after speaking of the policy of peace begun by William Penn with the Indians when he landed at Philadelphia, and successfully carried on by his successors for more than two generations, went on to say:—

“A further reason why Philadelphia should be selected is the fact, perhaps unknown to many of you, that the first suggestion for international arbitration of the *Alabama* Claims came from one of Philadelphia’s distinguished citizens—Thomas Balch. When dark clouds had gathered on the horizon following the depredation of the *Alabama*, Thomas Balch proposed to President Lincoln, as early as November, 1864, to submit the *Alabama* Claims for settlement to an international court of justice, composed of three jurists. Our martyred President could not at that time be persuaded that Mr. Balch’s scheme of arbitration was practicable, but it finally did prevail, and thus the first step towards the introduction of the principle of international arbitration in that matter was taken.

This masterpiece of statesmanship will ever redound to the credit and fame of its author. We are ever eager to worship and erect monuments in honor of heroes of war. Had war, instead of peaceful arbitration, settled the dispute, we should to-day probably find innumerable shafts and costly monuments in memory of the heroes of battles fought and battles won. Thanks to the initiative of Thomas Balch, war was avoided and peaceful settlement made. Let me suggest to you, my friends, that the hero of peace should at all times be placed before the hero of war. To give emphasis to this thought, I pay this tribute to the memory of Thomas Balch."

The above remarks of Mayor Blankenburg at the banquet have been printed as they were sent early in July by Thomas Raeburn White, Esq., of the Philadelphia Bar—who had charge of the local arrangements for the conference in Philadelphia—to the editor of this book. The Mayor's remarks, with the exception of a word here and there, and the omission of the last sentence, will be found printed in the booklet, *League to Enforce Peace; American Branch: Independence Hall Conference held in the city of Philadelphia, Bunker Hill Day, (June 17th), 1915, together with the speeches made at*

a public banquet in the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel on the preceding evening: printed by the League to Enforce Peace, 507 Fifth Avenue, New York City, 1915, see pages 12-13.

THOMAS WILLING BALCH,

Editor.

LAKE GEORGE, NEW YORK,

September 20th, 1915.

INTERNATIONAL
COURTS OF ARBITRATION.

INTERNATIONAL COURTS OF ARBITRATION.

TEN years ago the grave questions involved in the escape of the *Alabama* and her subsequent depredations were the subject of much thought and anxiety, and many were the suggestions made by the friends of peace as to a possible disposition of the controversy without resort to war. The situation had no encouraging aspect. Indeed, it is difficult to realize to-day how very hostile and angry were the two parties. The attitude assumed throughout by the English Government was such as to preclude apparently any hope of adjustment, and the American Minister at London was obliged to content himself at last with merely sending in a fresh claim for damages in a stereotyped phraseology. As the war for secession approached its close the Americans began to realize somewhat the enormous losses attendant upon it, not the least of which was the absolute destruction of their commerce. The tem-

per of the people was thoroughly roused, and any hostile demonstration at Washington would have met with a hearty and unanimous response throughout the country. President Lincoln not only remained calm himself, but wisely calmed, as far as he could, the popular excitement.

The most common method of settling national disputes, in modern times, where resort was had to arbitration, had been a reference to a monarch selected by the contending parties. But this plan was open to serious objections. Experience had disclosed that sovereigns were not free from the weaknesses of less exalted persons, and that prince and peasant alike, when once appointed sole arbiter, cannot resist man's innate tendency to find some award which will "split the difference," and which usually leaves the respective disputants equally dissatisfied. The United States had refused some years previously to accept such an award. A similar experience would have merely further exasperated a contest already sufficiently inflamed and embittered.

Another objection was in the great difficulty of finding a reigning sovereign who would prove acceptable to both parties. Napoleon III. was of a restless, yet dreamy character. He was not a statesman, scarcely even a politician. He was not satisfied with

mere political intrigue, for it was his nature to conspire. In 1859, therefore, obeying in part the behests of his temperament, he undoubtedly held guilty relations with some of the Southern gentlemen then in Paris, afterwards very prominent in the Confederate Councils. At the time, these relations were more or less matters of surmise or report. Later, they were stated in detail in the *Indépendance Belge*, in the winter of 1860-61, and were said to have been in substance, that an appeal had been made to the Emperor as head of the French race, on the ground that the larger part of the white inhabitants of Louisiana, of Florida, and South Carolina, and a portion of them in the other States, were of French extraction; that thereupon had been promised to these self-constituted plenipotentiaries an immediate recognition by France and England of the Seceding States, in case the separation was peaceably effected, and a prompt recognition as belligerents in case of an armed struggle.¹ Some not very obscure intimations

¹ It has been recently stated in the newspapers that the Comte de Paris, in the forthcoming volumes of *La Guerre Civile en Amérique*, will demonstrate that the French and English proclamations to this effect were premature, and contrary to the recognized usages of amical nations.

[*Histoire de la Guerre Civile en Amérique* par M. Le Comte de Paris. Paris, 1874, Volume II., page 205.—T. W. B.]

4 INTERNATIONAL COURTS OF ARBITRATION.

were given that at need something more than moral and political support might be relied on. This remarkable communication was doubtless no more than a correcter statement of the reports of the day. At all events it passed unchallenged, and subsequent events led close observers to believe, that it had been prepared by some one in authority. Not only was the Mexican expedition undertaken, but the Emperor and his ministers were actively at work, meddling, plotting against the American Government, until at last they went so far as to actually invite England and Russia to co-operate with France and insist upon an armistice.²

This mischievous activity was probably of more service than otherwise to the Northern States; but it had in one way or another provoked expressions of opinion from such important personages as von

² After these lines were sent to the printers, I received from a friend a cutting from the *New York Express*, September 1st, giving an account of an interview between Prince Gortschakoff and the American Minister at St. Petersburg, in which the Russian Chancellor is represented as going even further than is stated in the published Diplomatic Correspondence. The article asserts that in the event of any European interference, the Czar would have aided the Northern States with his fleet then at New York.

[Thomas Willing Balch: *The Alabama Arbitration*; Philadelphia, 1900, page 28, *et seq.*: *The Alaska Frontier*, Philadelphia, 1903, pages 60-66.—T. W. B.]

Bismarck, von Beust, Gortschakoff, and others, that it might be fairly said that there did not remain a court which was not in some way so compromised that it was quite impossible to find a royal referee.

Another grave objection to asking a sovereign to act as arbitrator lay in the fact, that a decision in the case of the *Alabama* could not be arrived at without passing in review almost all that part of international law which related to neutrals. A very serious matter indeed, in which the whole world was interested; an occasion which ought to serve for a great and marked progress, and a settlement on a firmer and more just basis of the rules which should govern neutrals and belligerents. The United States had naturally, before their independence was recognized, and at all times subsequently, maintained that the evils of a war should fall on the belligerents alone. Neutrals had hardships enough to bear in the commercial disorders and the financial losses consequent upon a serious disturbance of the general peace; therefore, the only possible pretense for the interference of a belligerent with a neutral was that of self-defense; in other words, to prevent the neutral from giving "aid and comfort" to the enemy, and they contended that the sea-going vessels of a neutral were

entitled to all the immunities and privileges of home waters. The American Government persistently endeavored by its diplomacy, by the decisions of its judicial tribunals, by resolutions in Congress, by declarations in the messages of its Presidents, to have these just and righteous principles recognized. In fact, it was for this that their last war with Great Britain (1812-15) was fought. The United States, it was supposed, would certainly press for an acceptance of these principles. But it was not likely that England would ever consent to relinquish her own long-cherished interpretation of the law of the sea. "The coarse dialectics of the older English judges"³ had "mixed sovereign and belligerent powers;"⁴ and, inspired by the spirit and precedents of the semi-barbarous times and deeds of Drake and Raleigh, claimed the right to sit in judgment in its own tribunals,

³ Wharton's *Criminal Law*. Preface to 7th ed., 1874: xviii.

⁴ *Belligerent and Sovereign Rights as regards neutrals during the War of Secession*: Boston, 1873. This is the able and learned argument of the Hon. William Beach Lawrence, in the case of the *Circassian*, before the Commissioners appointed under the twelfth article of the Treaty of Washington, and has much professional weight from the fact that the International Tribunal reversed the decision of the highest American Federal Court, as reported in II. Wallace's *United States Supreme Court Reports*, 135.

according to its own forms of procedure, upon the acts, the rights, the property, and even the liberties of citizens of a neutral state. From its courts, no matter how flagrant the wrong done, there was no appeal except a diplomatic representation to the king. It is not surprising, therefore, that the claims of English captors were upheld to the extremest limit possible, nor that many of the decisions of the English maritime tribunals were rank with injustice. Even when the increasing navies of other nations weighed sufficiently upon England's statesmen to obtain her assent to the declaration in the Treaty of Paris (April 16th, 1856), that an enemy's property on board neutral vessels, and neutral property found in an enemy's vessel, should be free from capture, except contraband of war, yet as, unfortunately, there was no formal definition of what should be considered contraband of war, British jurists forthwith applied their own narrow interpretation, and maintained that the products of a neutral state, though not directly applicable to warlike uses, but which might incidentally aid or assist a belligerent, were within the meaning of the phrase. It was not therefore probable that, if so much of the old leaven remained, there would be any chance of

8 INTERNATIONAL COURTS OF ARBITRATION.

England consenting to appear before a sovereign and to submit to his award.

Those who strove and yearned for a peaceable solution of these grave questions neither abandoned hope nor allowed themselves to be disheartened. Mr. Cobden wrote to me from Midhurst, March 12th, 1865: "I have great faith in the aggregate intelligence of your country whenever its attention is forced by adverse circumstances to a serious study of politics. When the war is over you will have a great financial difficulty to deal with.

* * * But you will soon surmount all these follies when the nation finds itself in the school of adversity." These words are the more noteworthy in that they were written but a few days before his lamented death.

Other modes of adjustment were suggested and discussed. Precedents were sought for and examined,⁵ and the research disclosed such various

⁵ [John Westlake: *International Law*: Cambridge University Press, 1904, part I., pages 332 *et seq.*—W. Evans Darby: *International Tribunals*: London, 1904.—John Bassett Moore: *Digest of International Law*: Washington, 1906, volume VII., page 24 *et seq.*—Ernest Nys: *Les États-Unis et le Droit des Gens*: Brussels, 1909, pages 139–143.—Thomas Willing Balch: *Le Nouveau Cynée; réimpression du text original de 1623 avec introduction et traduction anglaise*: Philadelphia, 1909.—J. de Louter: *Het Stellig Volkenrecht*: The

schemes, almost stratagems, for settling disputes without recourse to war, that one was tempted to assert that a philosophy directly the reverse of that upheld by the author of "Leviathan" was more in consonance with the nature of man.⁶ After mature reflection a Court of Arbitration, in substance that developed in the following letter, was proposed to various jurists who took an interest in the matter.

In November, 1864, during a short visit to America, I had an opportunity of mentioning the proposed Court of Arbitration to President Lincoln. He observed that the idea was a good one in the abstract, but that in the then temper of the American people it was neither possible nor popular. In fact, as he quaintly expressed it, we were not near enough to the millennium for such methods of settling international quarrels. Still, he thought the idea worth airing.⁷

Hague, 1910, page 121 *et seq.*—Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart.: *The Modern Law of Nations and the Prevention of War in the Cambridge Modern History*, New York, 1910, Volume XII., pages 703-729, 954-956.—Milenko R. Vesnitch: *Deux Précurseurs Français du Pacifisme et de l'Arbitrage International*: Paris, 1911.—L. Oppenheim: *International Law*, second edition, London, 1912, Volume I., page 58.—T.W.B.

⁶ *Libertas*. Molesworth's ed., 1839-1845, II., 157 *et seq.*

⁷ [Among my father's papers I find the following notes written in

10 INTERNATIONAL COURTS OF ARBITRATION.

A draft outline of the proposed Court of Arbitration was refused by more than one editor; but at last Mr. Greeley, who feared no unpopularity

1872, in Europe, of this interview with President Lincoln. I have compared this extract carefully with the original manuscript.

"In November, 1864, I had (at the request of General Banks), a long interview with Mr. Lincoln in which he questioned me, then lately returned from Europe, largely about affairs on this side of the Atlantic. The Mexican Empire he ridiculed and said that he considered it 'a pasteboard concern on which we won't waste a man nor a dollar. It will soon tumble to pieces and maybe, bring the other down with it.' * * * In speaking of England, I suggested an arbitration court as possible at a future day. He thought it 'a very amiable idea, but not possible just now as the millennium is still a long way off.' But he added: 'There is no possible risk of a quarrel with England as we have enough on our hands. One quarrel is enough for a nation or a man at a time.' As to the proposed court of arbitration he said: 'Start your idea. It may make its way in time as it is a good one.' On arriving in London, December 25th, '64, I spoke of it to several friends, but found no one to treat it other than as a conceit of a well-meaning, weak-minded enthusiast, except Mr. Cobden to whom I wrote, as he was out of town. From him I received more than one kind letter, and it was stated in the *New York Tribune* in a letter from Paris, though he never said so to me, that but for his untimely death, he would have brought the subject before the House of Commons.

"In America I was met in a less satisfactory manner. The Civil War was near its end, and the passions aroused by it were at their highest. I received more than one angry rebuff, and sometimes the contempt which the idea excited was not always civil. Some good people went so far as to say that I had lived so long abroad that I had become a '—— Britisher.' Not encouraging for my idea of a mild mannered way of cutting the knot of difficult national questions.

where a cause was, as he thought, entitled to a hearing, gave it a place in the columns of the *New York Tribune*, May 13th, 1865.⁸ The letter was

"I did not, as I have already observed, know Mr. Greeley personally, but through my friend, Mr. W. H. Huntington, the then correspondent at Paris of the *New York Tribune*, I obtained access to its columns and had a hearing for the scheme [May 13th, 1865].

"*Social Science* [in England] reprinted the letter March 15th, 1867. The *Courier du Dimanche*, through Monsieur Prévost-Paradol, and on one occasion the *Journal des Débats*, lent a kindly assistance. But the project received a powerful impulse from a lecture by Mr. James Lorimer, the Professor of Public Law and the Laws of Nations in the University of Edinburgh. After which the idea took root and grew and now the Tribunal at Geneva is hailed by publicists and statesmen as an international benefit. But it is mainly due to Mr. Greeley that the idea was not strangled at its birth."

James Lorimer was born in 1818 at Aberdalgie, Perth, Scotland, and died February 13th, 1890, at Edinburgh; he wrote several valuable books on social science and international law, and was a founder in 1873 of *l'Institut de Droit International*. Prévost-Paradol, the brilliant author of *La France Nouvelle* (1868), and a member of *l'Académie Française*, was the leading writer in the *Journal des Débats* against the Empire. In the days of the Imperial censorship, as some one said, "Prévost-Paradol excellait avec J. J. Weiss dans l'art de tout faire entendre sans tout exprimer." Subsequently, when Ollivier assumed the responsibilities of Government in 1870 under the *liberal* Empire, Prévost-Paradol accepted the post of Minister to Washington.—T. W. B.]

⁸ [This letter will be found in the *New York Tribune* of May 13th, 1865, on the fourth page, in the upper right hand corner under the title, "England and the United States: a letter from Thomas Balch." —T. W. B.]

addressed to the able and conscientious correspondent of that journal at Paris, Mr. W. H. Huntington, and was as follows:—

“PARIS, March 31st, 1865.

“MY DEAR SIR,—You asked me to put in writing the observations which I made to you yesterday touching the outstanding questions between England and the United States. I should be sorry to make you read all that you so kindly listened to. It would be to tax you rather too severely. But the current of my remarks was to this effect:

“I. That both England and the United States preferred claims which, if not judiciously managed, might and perhaps would lead to war.

“II. That the American claims were chiefly the depredations of the *Alabama*, whilst it seemed from the tenor of Mr. Layard’s recent speech, that the British claims were also such as to rest upon questions of law. Neither set of claims was strictly national; they were rather those of individuals, merchants, shipowners, and others.

“III. That as to such claims, war was a barbarous manner of enforcing them; that the most successful war would after all be a most expensive and unsatisfactory process of litigation; and that the civilized and Christian way of ascertaining

their validity and extent should be by arbitration.

“IV. That the best manner of composing such a Court of Arbitration would be, that each party should select some competent jurist, those two to select an umpire. The claims to be presented, proved and argued before this Court, whose decisions should be final and without appeal.

“V. That such a proposition, proceeding from our Government, would, without doubt, receive the countenance and support of all intelligent Englishmen. It is true that some of the speeches recently made in Parliament about us and Canada are of a nature to discourage such expectations. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that these gentlemen form a class apart; that it is their political faith to believe and say unseemly things of Republican institutions, of the men, habits of life, and principles of action developed under them. But it was long ago that the wisest of men gave us the measure of such people, and the experience of mankind has confirmed his judgment.

“VI. Such a proposition from our Government would at once quiet all the foolish alarms which have, or appear to have, taken possession of so many persons in England. It would also uphold and strengthen all the advocates of progress. It

14 INTERNATIONAL COURTS OF ARBITRATION.

would give greater force to their arguments in favor of just reforms and liberty; and this not only in Great Britain, but throughout Europe. The abandonment of the old system of arbitration by a reference to a Sovereign, more or less unfit from the very nature of his position, and the introduction of a tribunal, almost republican in its character, whose decisions would have a weight as precedents, an authority heretofore unknown as expositions of international law, would be no trifling events in the march of Democratic Freedom.

“VII. Such a proposition would also be in accord with our traditional policy of peace and goodwill towards men.

“The most serious objection that has been urged, so far as I have heard, against such a Court of Arbitration, is the difficulty of finding gentlemen not already biased by their feelings or in some way committed in their opinions.

“This objection applies, however, in a measure, to all human tribunals; it would apply to arbitration by a sovereign, and would leave us no solution other than the dread arbitrament of war. For myself, I cannot believe that there are not to be had in England and America gentlemen of the requisite learning, experience, and impartiality for

a position so dignified and useful. At all events, there are many eminent men in Europe in every way qualified for this high duty. I have in my mind's eye a Swiss publicist,⁹ who, after having filled the most responsible stations at home, is now worthily representing his people in their most important diplomatic post. The decisions rendered by him and gentlemen like him would be such as two great and free nations could accept with satisfaction. I dare say he has friendly feelings towards the Republic, but he cannot be wanting in like sentiments for the old Champion of Liberty. The preferences of such enlightened statesmen could not possibly be of a character to influence their judgments, and the parties most

⁹ I may now say that this referred to that most worthy, high-minded gentleman, Dr. Kern, formerly President of the Federal Council, but then Minister to France.

[Johann Conrad Kern was born in 1808 at Berlingen in the Canton of Thurgau, and died in 1888. After beginning the study of theology at the University of Bale, he studied law at the Universities of Berlin, Heidelberg, and Paris. In 1833 he sat in the Swiss Diet, then in the National Assembly, and in 1837 he was made President of the Supreme Tribunal. In 1848, with Henri Druet of the Canton of Vaud, he drew up a draft constitution for Switzerland, which, after being debated and amended by the Diet, was adopted by the cantons and proclaimed September 12, 1848. In 1850 he was chosen President of the Federal Council. In 1857 he was appointed Swiss Minister at Paris and held that post until 1883.—T. W. B.]

interested might well be content to abide their award.

"Believe me, my dear sir, yours sincerely,
"THOMAS BALCH."

The publication of this letter proved very conclusively, that whatever might be the merits of the proposed Court of Arbitration, it certainly was not popular in the United States. Two years later the accomplished editor of *Social Science*, Mr. Westlake, was induced by an English jurist,¹⁰ for whose

¹⁰ [Professor James Lorimer.

John Westlake, was born at Lostwithiel, Cornwall, February 4th, 1828. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was sixth Wrangler and sixth in the first class Classical Tripos. He became a barrister, Lincoln's Inn, 1854, and a Bencher of Lincoln's Inn, 1874. In 1869, with G. Rolin-Jaequemyns of Brussels and Asser of Amsterdam, he founded the *Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée* at Brussels, of which he has ever since been an editor; and in 1873 he was one of the founders of *l'Institut de Droit International*. In 1877 the University of Edinburgh gave him the degree of LL.D. (*honoris causa*). In 1885 he was elected to Parliament for the Romford Division of Essex. In 1888 Oxford University conferred on him the degree of D.C.L. (*honoris causa*), and the same year he was chosen to fill the Whewell chair of International Law at Cambridge University, which he held until 1908. From 1900 to 1906 he was one of the British members of The Hague International Court of Arbitration. In 1895 he was President of *l'Institut de Droit International* and to-day he is the Honorary President of that association. In 1858 he published *A Treatise on Private International*

~~ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.~~

We have been asked to re-publish the following important letter, addressed to the Editor of the *New York Tribune*—

Paris, May 18. 1865

"MY DEAR SIR,—You asked me to put in writing the observations which I made to you yesterday touching the outstanding questions between England and the United States. I should be sorry to make you read all that you so kindly listened to. It would be to tax you rather too severely. But the current of my remarks was to this effect:—

I That both England and the United States preferred claims which, if not judiciously managed, might and perhaps would lead to war

II That the American claims were chiefly the depredations of the Alabama, while it seemed from the tenor of Mr Layard's recent speech, that the British claims were also such as to rest upon questions of law. Neither set of claims was strictly national, they were rather those of individuals, merchants, ship-owners, and others.

III. That as to such claims, war was a barbarous manner of enforcing them, that the most successful war would after all be a most expensive and unsatisfactory process of litigation; and that the civilized and christian way of ascertaining their validity and extent would be by arbitration.

IV That the best manner of composing such a court of arbitration would be, that each party should select some competent jurist, those two to select an umpire. The claims to be presented, proved, and argued before this Court, whose decisions should be final and without appeal.

V. That such a proposition, proceeding from our Government, would without doubt, receive the countenance and support of all intelligent Englishman. It is true, that some of the speeches recently made in Parliament about us and Canada are of a nature to discourage such expectations. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind, that these gentlemen form a class apart, that it is their political faith to believe and say unseemly things of Republican institutions, of the men, habits of life, and principles of action developed under them. But it was long ago that the wisest of men gave us the measure of such people and the experience of mankind has confirmed his judgement.

VI. Such a proposition from our Government would at once quiet all the foolish alarms which have, or appear to have, taken possession of so many persons in England. It would also uphold and strengthen all the advocates of progress. It would give greater force to their arguments in favour of just reforms and more liberty; and this not only in Great Britain, but throughout Europe. The abandonment of the old system of arbitration by a reference to a Sovereign, more or less unfit from the very nature of his position, and the introduction of a tribunal, almost republican in its character, whose decisions would have a weight as precedents, an authority heretofore unknown as expositions of international law, would be no trifling events in the march of Democratic Freedom.

VII. Such a proposition would also be in accord with our traditional policy of peace and goodwill towards men.

The most serious objection that has been urged, so far as I have heard,

against such a Court of Arbitration, is the difficulty of finding gentlemen not already biased by their feelings or in some way committed in their opinions.

This objection applies, however, in measure to all human tribunals; it would apply to arbitration by a sovereign, and would leave us no other solution than the dread arbitrament of war. For myself I cannot believe that there are not to be had in England and America, gentlemen of the requisite learning, experience, and impartiality for a position so dignified and useful. At all events, there are many eminent men in Europe in every way qualified for this high duty. I have in my mind's eye a Swiss publicist, who, after having filled the most responsible stations at home, is now worthily representing his people in their most important diplomatic post. The decisions rendered by him and gentlemen like him would be such as two great and free nations could accept with satisfaction. I dare say he has friendly feelings towards the Republic, but he cannot be wanting in like sentiments for the old champion of liberty. The preferences of such enlightened statesmen could not possibly be of a character to influence their judgments, and the parties most interested might well be content to abide their award.

Believe me, my dear sir, yours sincerely,

THOMAS BALCH.

This letter was reprinted in Social Science, March 1871
1867 under the heading of England and America in the U.S.

THE LICENSING LAWS

At the last meeting of the Council the discussion on the proposed Memorial to the Home Secretary relative to the Licensing Laws was adjourned. As the debate will be resumed at the Council Meeting next Thursday, this is the best time for giving our promised abstract of the arguments then adduced. The Memorial is as follows:—

"They would therefore respectfully urge Her Majesty's Government to introduce a measure amending the present laws at as early a period as possible, in accordance with the recommendations above enumerated of that Committee, with one important exception. They are strongly of opinion that the licensing authority should be vested, not in the magistrates, but in a small Board to be selected for that special purpose by the ratepayers of every borough, parish, or union district, in the same way as guardians of the poor are now elected."

The Rev. S. A. STRATHAIRN referred to the proposed adoption of the memorial, to the almost universal dissatisfaction existing with reference to the present laws regarding licenses, and to the fact that several Committees of both Houses of Parliament had reported against the present laws, and in favour of certain amendments. He especially called attention to the recommendations contained in the report made by Mr. Villiers' Committee in 1854, and pointed out how the increase of number of the tax on licenses proposed by that committee would limit the number of houses licensed, and would thereby be beneficial. He further dwelt upon the desirability of demanding that the Committee should consider the conditions of the license, and his statement was in full agreement with the theory that the granting of all licenses should be under the control of one and the same authority. But the recommendation that authority should be vested in the local magistracy, he could not advocate. He reminded the Council of the con-

Dear Mr. Prentiss:
Please inform me that, as I have no other
copy - if you find the two you certainly thank me.

opinion he had great respect, to reprint it in that periodical, March 15th, 1867, and spoke of it as an "important letter," but made no further comment.¹¹

Law, or the Conflict of Laws, which has now reached a fifth edition; in 1894, *Chapters on the Principles of International Law*; in 1904, *International Law*, Part I., *Peace* (a second edition, 1910), and in 1907, Part II., *War* (of which a second edition is promised). He has contributed many articles upon International Law to the *Revue de Droit International*, *The Law Quarterly Review*, and other magazines. Dr. Westlake died April 14th, 1913.

In a letter dated from London, April 17th, 1896, Mr. Westlake wrote to the editor of this reprint as follows: "I may remark, by the way, with regard to the mention of my name on page [16], that I was not *editor of Social Science*, but, as an officer of the now defunct Social Science Association, I was able to get Mr. Balch's letter inserted in the little publication which belonged to the association."

Among the members of the Social Science Association in 1867, were the Right Hon. Sir Stafford Northcote, Bart., M.P., one of the negotiators of the Treaty of Washington (1871), Earl Russell, Lord Brougham, John Stuart Mill, M.P., and many other members of Parliament, David Dudley Field of the New York Bar, and F. von Holtzendorff of Berlin.—T. W. B.]

¹¹ [The following extract is from a newspaper of Lausanne.—T. W. B.]

"Un journal anglais des sciences économiques et sociales publie sur la question de l'*Alabama* et des indemnités réclamées par le gouvernement des États-Unis, une lettre écrite par un juriste habile de Philadelphie, résidant à Paris. Après avoir touché quelques uns des points en litige, l'écrivain démontre que le seul moyen raisonnable, civilisé, chrétien, pratique de régler cette question dangereuse, avant qu'une nouvelle guerre ne fasse surgir des complications nouvelles, c'est la nomination d'une cour arbitrale, prise en dehors des souverains

18 INTERNATIONAL COURTS OF ARBITRATION.

Nevertheless, the idea was well received by such men as Laboulaye, Henri Moreau, and other members of the *Société de Législation Comparée*, in France; by von Holtzendorff, Kapp, and other honored publicists in Germany. That the letter in which the plan was originally sketched out should be lost sight of was quite natural and usual. I know of no more affecting picture of the *sic vos, non vobis*, haps and mishaps of literary life than that traced by Bluntschli in his introduction to his "Code of Belligerent Laws,"¹² where he tells how the men who propounded or elaborated some great governing principle of International Law have, in the course of time, been as absolutely forgotten as the skillful but obscure workman who converts the dingy pebble into the brilliant gem. The proposed tribunal was, however, made the subject of some articles and two or three prelections. Discussion gave it vitality. It grew in favor, was considered plausible, then feasible, and

de l'Europe. L'écrivain propose comme éminemment apte à faire partie de cette commission, par son habilité, son indépendance et son complet désintéressement dans cette question, l'honorable M. Kern, ambassadeur de la Suisse à Paris. L'idée est neuve et heureuse."]

¹² *Le Droit International Codifié*, par M. Bluntschli, translated by M. Lardy, Secretary to the Swiss Legation, Paris, 1870.

finally took a visible form and shape in the Treaty of Washington.¹³

It is not within the purview of these observations to discuss at large the provisions of that Treaty. The Three Rules are so obnoxious to numerous and serious objections that it is much to be hoped in the interest of neutrals and honest people generally, that the United States and England will disagree so permanently and effectually as to their construction and meaning as to have nothing more said or heard of them, except the just and severe criticism and condemnation which they will probably receive from the distinguished jurists who are soon to meet in Geneva. Had the synod of diplomatists who framed these obscurely expressed rules profited by the occasion to overthrow some of the barbarisms still upheld, and, for example, joined in adopting as a principle of law the decision of the Supreme Court at Berlin, "that every contract for introducing contraband goods into a friendly State is contrary to law and morals,"¹⁴ they would have rendered a vast service

¹³ [Concerning the Geneva arbitration see Frank Warren Hackett: *Reminiscences of the Geneva Tribunal of Arbitration*, 1872; *The Alabama Claims*: New York and Boston, 1911.—T. W. B.]

¹⁴ *Heffler*, cited by Lawrence, Com. III., 401.

to mankind. Perhaps, also, had Mr. Cobden lived, his counsels might have so far prevailed as to have given to the Treaty as a whole a character and spirit which would have rendered it more acceptable to the English people at large, more auspicious also for the future of peaceable arbitrations of international difficulties. It is not to be overlooked that from time to time ebullitions, both in and out of Parliament, such as the question of Sir Henry Wolfe, the observations of Earl Russell, prove that there still exists a certain uneasiness as to the present as well as the past position of Great Britain in that transaction. A few lines from one of his later letters exhibit the standpoint from which Mr. Cobden regarded the conduct of his own country, and from it we may infer the character which he would have probably endeavored to impress upon the negotiations:—

“MIDHURST, 3d January, 1865.

“MY DEAR MR. BALCH,—I was very sorry to miss the opportunity of seeing you in London. There are very many topics on which I should liked to have talked with you. * * * I think it depends entirely on the discretion of your own authorities at Washington to remain at peace with all the world until your civil war is ended. I do

not say that you have not grievances; but one quarrel at a time, as Mr. Lincoln says, is enough for a nation or an individual.¹⁵ *With the British Government I do not think, on the whole, you have as much to be angry about as to be grateful for what it has refused to do.*"¹⁶

¹⁵ An observation which Mr. Lincoln made to the writer [Thomas Balch] in the conversation above mentioned. [See note 7.]

¹⁶ [From the *New York Daily Tribune*, April 21st, 1865, page 8.

"THE DEATH OF RICHARD COBDEN.

"From our own Correspondent.

[Mr. W. H. Huntington.]

"PARIS, April 5th, 1865.

"The sad event of the day is the death of Richard Cobden. Honorable to him as to the French people is the universality of honorable, intelligent homage paid to his memory by all sorts and classes of intelligent Frenchmen.

"*La Presse* (Girardin's paper) came out in mourning last Monday evening, heralding the first sad news of Cobden's death. The eulogium pronounced on Cobden by Girardin—more witty even than touching—you will find a copy of in your European files, but all the journals of Paris have hastened to do honor to the great commoner. And while the Government spokesman in the Corps Legislatif finds apt occasion to say a word of eulogium in favor of the honest, wise English statesman to which all the house, Imperial and Opposition, cordially responded, no official or unofficial, nor mean, insidious breath anywheres breathes any thing but honor and funeral wailing over the name of Richard Cobden.

"I have not time to quote, as I would, some passages from the

Those Americans, who remember the official account given in the *Moniteur* of the visit of Messrs. Osborne and Lindsay to Compiègne, or recall the letters exchanged between M. Thouvenel

sincere tribute paid, not merely in formal ceremony to his memory, but to his ever-living idea by Emile [de] Girardin.

"A countryman of ours who has for years been in constant correspondence with Richard Cobden, permits me in the interest of the readers of *The Tribune*, to copy from a few of the letters received by him from Mr. Cobden, the following brief extracts. They stand in need of no explanatory comments. The plain good sense is patent. It may be excusable to note to to-day's readers the dates of the extracts of Mr. Cobden's letters to Mr. Balch, and I have reason to add the expression of my conviction, based on various probabilities, that, had Richard Cobden lived, he would have been (indeed by self logic must have been) a strenuous, earnest advocate of that scheme of arbitration or of some similar scheme of arbitration of the 'Alabama claim,' notes of which I had the honor to be the communicator to *The Tribune* a week or so ago.

"Here follow such scant words as can be safely picked out from the sacredness of private correspondence. Had Richard Cobden been less one of ours than his very nature and gifts and triumphs, his aspirations and large sympathies made him, still would his written thoughts be worth our heeding, intrinsically worth as they are 'profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.'

"MIDHURST, 3d January, 1865.

"MY DEAR MR. BALCH:

"I was very sorry to miss the opportunity of seeing you in London. There are very many topics on which I should have liked to have talked with you. * * * I think it depends entirely on the discretion of your own authorities at Washington to remain at peace with all the world until your civil war is ended. I do not say that you have not

and Mr. Dayton, or the avowed purposes of the Mexican expedition, will probably concur in the opinion thus expressed by Mr. Cobden.

Whatever the criticisms to which the Treaty

grievances; but one quarrel at a time, as Mr. Lincoln says, is enough for a nation or an individual. With the British Government I do not think, on the whole, you have as much to be angry about as to be grateful for what it has refused to do. * * *

“MIDHURST, 17th Feb., 1865.

“[To the same.] Your letter with the enclosure only reached me here to-day. It was addressed to 27 Victoria St. But I have not yet been able to go to London to attend my duties in Parliament. I am weather bound here. My health is greatly improved, but I do not care to run the risk of night sittings in the House, when there is really nothing before Parliament for which any sensible man would think himself called upon to commit martyrdom.

* * * * *

“‘There never was a more absurd canard than that invented by the Southern sympathizers—that England and France contemplated an intervention. And there is almost as great absurdity in the programme which the same party has cut out for you when war ends—viz., that you are to begin a war with France or England on all the world. Now, I have a very different work in store for you. When the war ceases, you will be like two line-of-battle ships after a desperate struggle; all hands will be required to clear the wreck, repair damages in hull and rigging, look after the wounded and bury the dead. There will be great suffering among all classes before you return to a normal state of things. You have been in a saturnalia of greenbacks and Government expenditure, which may be likened to the pleasant excitement of alcohol. But peace will be the headache after the debauch, with the unpleasant tavern reckoning.’

may in whole or in parts be open, there remained for the friends of peace and international arbitration the great, triumphant fact that the Court did meet at Geneva and by its award averted, as far

“MIDHURST, 12th March, 1865.

“[To the same.] * * * I have great faith in the aggregate intelligence of your country whenever its attention is forced by adverse circumstances to a serious study of politics. As soon as the war is over, it will be found that you have a great financial difficulty to deal with. *We* have gone through it all. Political economy, like chemistry or mechanics, is universal in the operation of its laws. You can no more disregard or fail to imitate our financial policy in raising your future revenue than you can reject our locomotives or our last improvement in dyeing calicoes. At present, your Finance Committees in Congress are pursuing a course which our oldest Tories would turn up their noses at. In fact, you are just where we were in 1818, before Huskisson, Peel and Gladstone were heard of in the path of financial reform. Nay, a good many of your public men, led by Mr. ———, seem to be going back to the ‘maximum’ of the French Revolution, and are for fixing the price of gold! When he has succeeded, I shall pray him to come here to regulate the weather and put down the east wind! But you will soon surmount all these follies when the nation finds itself in the school of adversity.

“‘Would it be too much to ask you to send me the pamphlet marked in the inclosed? I shall be happy if you will make similar use of me when I am in London.

“‘Believe me, [etc.],

“‘R. COBDEN.’”

I have compared the above extracts from Richard Cobden's letters with the originals which are now in my possession. The gentleman mentioned by Mr. Cobden, in his letter of March 12th, but whose name is omitted in the extract quoted above by Mr. Huntington, was “Mr. Stevens.” Richard Cobden died April 2nd, 1865.—T. W. B.]

as human probabilities go, an appeal to arms. That the United States and English Commissioners were rather too national and demonstrative, does not seriously militate against such courts, but merely touches the construction of them; and we have a notable proof of their value and integrity in the Court of the Mixed Commission which sat at Newport in 1873, to hear and decide upon the English and American claims. In the case of the *Circassian*, already mentioned, Count Corti, the President of the Commission, took it upon himself to overrule the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, an act of high judicial courage, which, apart from its legal bearings, is an omen of great promise, for it proves that men of character will sit in such dignified tribunals and render impartial decisions.¹⁷

Likewise that the United States has kept the money so promptly and honorably paid does not touch the question of international arbitration or its desirableness. The prolonged struggle in Congress over the disposition of these funds may be

¹⁷ Count Corti tells me that his reason for cutting down the claim was this: That it is true the blockade was raised by Federal success; but such was not the case when the *Circassian* sailed. She, therefore, left *in delicto*, and continued so, till nearly the end of her voyage.

never so dishonest or discreditable to the American legislative authorities, but it does not impugn the justice of the decision by which they were placed in the hands of that Government in its capacity as a great national trustee. To present the claims for "indirect losses" may have been an act of audacious chicane which reflected no credit on those who did it; but the tribunal did itself honor, and gave us a valuable precedent by ruling against their admissibility.

The friends of International Courts of Arbitration may fairly assert that this mode of settling great national questions has been fully and successfully tried, that it may be considered as having thereby passed into and henceforth forming a distinct part of that uncertain and shapeless mass of decision and dicta which we call International Law. Without participating in the visions so grandly developed by Zuinglius,¹⁸ and so fondly cherished by Grotius, of the good time, a good time to be won only by toil and unremitting efforts,—

"Till the war-drums throbbed no longer, and the battle flags were
furl'd,

In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the World." ¹⁹

¹⁸ *Civitas Christiana*.

¹⁹ Tennyson's *Locksley Hall*.

we may reasonably expect that through such tribunals, through their proceedings and decisions, and not through empirical codes, we may ultimately arrive at some more tangible and better ordered system of International Law; one to which the assent of civilized peoples may be given greatly to the benefit and peace of mankind.

A deep, well-settled conviction that this great advance in human progress is not only imminent, but has already commenced and is assured for the future, makes it incumbent on its advocates to examine carefully and philosophically the various forms in which Courts of Arbitration may be organized, and especially the limits within which their authority may be beneficially exercised. I received not very long since a communication from Professor Lorimer, notable for its calm and magisterial discussion of these points. As the *New York Tribune* had given light and life to my original letter, it seemed but proper that the observations of this distinguished jurist should appear first in its columns. They were accompanied April 11th, 1874, by an article supposed to be from the pen of the chief editor, Mr. Whitelaw Reid,²⁰ the character

²⁰ [Whitelaw Reid, editor-in-chief of the *New York Tribune* from 1872 to 1913, filled many important posts. He was American Minister

and interest of which induce me to reprint it here instead of any introductory remarks of my own.

“LIMITS OF ARBITRATION.

“About nine years ago, the *Tribune* published a letter from Mr. Thomas Balch, recommending almost precisely the plan of arbitration in the *Alabama* case, which after infinite discussion, was finally adopted and carried out to so satisfactory a conclusion at Geneva. It is in reference to that early communication of Mr. Balch that Prof. James Lorimer, the Regius Professor of Public Law and of the Law of Nations, in the University of Edinburgh, has written to him the letter which we print this morning. It is worthy of special attention as the mature utterance of a publicist who, having devoted his life to the study of international law and the theories of international relations, and having been a prominent advocate of arbitration and a constant protestant against the barbarism of war, retains enough of impartial

to France, 1889-1892, Republican candidate for Vice-President of the United States in 1892, special American Ambassador to Queen Victoria's jubilee in 1897, an American peace commissioner to treat with Spain at Paris in 1898, and special American Ambassador for the Coronation of Edward the Seventh in 1902. He was American Ambassador to Great Britain from 1905 until his death in 1913.—T. W. B.]

calmness of judgment to recognize the limits which are probably imposed upon the capabilities of arbitration by the conditions of human nature and civilized policy.

“Professor Lorimer expects nothing of arbitration, for instance, in cases where one party is morally incapable of entering rationally into a contract, or physically incapable of enforcing its provisions when made. This excludes most of the fighting which ordinarily falls to the lot of England. It is evident that neither the Emperor Theodore nor the King Coffee-Kalkalli was capable of appreciating any procedure except the one which was put in force against them both. Neither is there any prospect that the civilized world will ever be able to interfere with the progress or the result of civil wars. Prof. Lorimer does not state that as his own conclusion, but his references to the Paris Commune and our own war of the Rebellion would lead in that direction. In cases where the real object of a war is to determine the relative strength of two nations, and where an unquestioned supremacy is to be the prize of victory, it is clear that arbitration is hopeless, except by an armed intervention of allied powers too imposing to be resisted. It was, for example, impossible to pre-

vent the Franco-Prussian conflict. The trivial question of the interview of Benedetti and King William in the garden at Ems, might of course have been arranged in any half-hour's session of a jury of gentlemen. But the genuine, unmanageable question which remained behind, was the one which could not be peacefully settled; that is, whether Prussia or France was the stronger. The field of arbitration seems therefore to be limited to the class of disputes of which the *Alabama* and the San Juan Boundary questions are specimens. How narrow this field is, may be seen when we reflect that except in case of great popular excitement they would never have been made a pretext for war, and that if this excitement had really existed they could not have been referred to arbitration. The world is yet far from that millennial condition when reason and charity are to exercise a commanding influence upon disputes between nations. The better sense of mankind has come, however, to recognize the irrational character of war, and the advocates of peaceful international tribunals are probably not too sanguine in hoping that the future is theirs. But at present their nearest attainable ideal is the establishment of an international organization of force which shall pre-

vent wars by armed menace. There are many who doubt whether armies will not survive courts of justice, and Mr. Lorimer cogently observes: 'When I hear of a State of which the citizens have become so reasonable and dispassionate as to abolish compulsory jurisdiction and to trust to voluntary arbitration, I shall then begin to have higher hopes of international reason and moderation, and, consequently, of international arbitration.'"

The letter from Professor Lorimer, thus spoken of, was as follows:—

"NO. 1, BRUNTSFIELD CRESCENT, EDINBURGH,
"FEBRUARY 10th, 1874.

"Considering the interest which is everywhere taken in International Arbitration at present, and more especially with a view to the discussion that will take place at the meeting of the International Institute at Geneva in October, I think it very desirable that you should republish the letter which you addressed to the '*New York Tribune*' in 1865, adding to it such suggestions as your observation of subsequent events may enable you to offer.

"I do not know to what extent that letter, or anything else you said or did, may have led to the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington, by which

the threatened war between our countries is believed by many to have been averted; but certain it is, that the letter was a very remarkable anticipation of the treaty which was negotiated six years afterward. The tribunal which you suggested almost exactly corresponded to that appointed under Article XII.²¹ of the Treaty, and even the great tribunal which sat at Geneva under Article I.²²

²¹ [In Article XII. of the Treaty of Washington (1871), after a statement of some matters other than the *Alabama* claims that should be referred for settlement to three Commissioners, provision was made for the appointment of the Commissioners in the following manner: "One Commissioner shall be named by the President of the United States, one by Her Britannic Majesty, and a third by the President of the United States and Her Britannic Majesty conjointly; and in case the third Commissioner shall not have been so named within a period of three months from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this treaty, then the third Commissioner shall be named by the Representative at Washington of His Majesty the King of Spain. In case of the death, absence, or incapacity of any Commissioner, or in the event of any Commissioner omitting or ceasing to act, the vacancy shall be filled in the manner hereinbefore provided for making the original appointment; the period of three months in case of such substitution being calculated from the date of the happening of the vacancy." *Treaties and Conventions concluded between the United States of America and other Powers since July 4, 1776*. Department of State. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889, page 484.—T. W. B.]

²² [In Article I., the Court of Arbitration to consist of five Arbitrators to try the "*Alabama* Claims" was provided for as follows:

"One [Arbitrator] shall be named by the President of the United

was only a fuller realization of your original conception, by a larger infusion of the neutral element than you had contemplated, into the Court. In this respect it certainly was an improvement. But for the presence of the neutral judges it is doubtful if the work would have been brought to a successful

States; one shall be named by Her Britannic Majesty; His Majesty the King of Italy shall be requested to name one; the President of the Swiss Confederation shall be requested to name one; and His Majesty the Emperor of Brazil shall be requested to name one.

"In case of the death, absence, or incapacity to serve of any or either of the said Arbitrators, or, in the event of either of the said Arbitrators omitting or declining or ceasing to act as such, the President of the United States, or Her Britannic Majesty, or His Majesty the King of Italy, or the President of the Swiss Confederation, or His Majesty the Emperor of Brazil, as the case may be, may forthwith name another person to act as Arbitrator in the place and stead of the Arbitrator originally named by such head of a State.

"And in the event of the refusal or omission for two months after receipt of the request from either of the high contracting parties of His Majesty the King of Italy, or the President of the Swiss Confederation, or His Majesty the Emperor of Brazil, to name an Arbitrator either to fill the original appointment or in the place of one who may have died, be absent, or incapacitated, or who may omit, decline or from any cause cease to act as such Arbitrator, His Majesty the King of Sweden and Norway shall be requested to name one or more persons, as the case may be, to act as such Arbitrator or Arbitrators." *Treaties and Conventions concluded between the United States of America and other Powers since July 4, 1776.* Department of State. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889, page 479.—T. W. B.]

issue, and I think it very worthy of consideration whether, on all future occasions, the Commissioners ought not to be appointed exclusively from neutrals.

“In his introduction to his pamphlet on *Belligerent and Sovereign Rights*, which contains his very able pleading in the case of the *Circassian*, Mr. W. Beach Lawrence remarks on the want of judicial dignity and impartiality displayed by the Commissioners of both the interested nations, and adds: ‘In that tribunal there were three other members, and two of them might, perhaps, without serious inconvenience, have been withdrawn from the bench.’ I confess I am much disposed to agree with him. The judges of such a court, as it seems to me, ought all to be neutrals, the belligerents, so to speak, appearing only in their true character as litigants. Whether their judges ought all to be chosen by neutrals is another question. With a view to removing or mitigating the aversion which proud and jealous nations naturally feel to intrusting their honor and their interests to others, it might probably be expedient that each litigant should retain the direct appointment of one member of the court, binding itself not to select him from its own citizens, or from the citizens of any State that was dependent upon it.

"But the chief difficulties attending International Arbitration have reference, not to the organization of suitable tribunals, but to the determination of the character of the parties capable of organizing them, and the character of the questions that can be submitted to them. In this country there is a tendency to pooh-pooh arbitration altogether, on the ground of the limited sphere of its possible operation; and to save it from ridicule and vindicate for it the position to which it is really entitled, I do think it very important that we jurists should try whether we cannot eliminate the impossible cases and moderate the expectations of its injudicious advocates.²³ It is very much this task which the Institute proposes to itself in the first instance, and I know no one more able to aid in its accomplishment than yourself, privileged as you are to enjoy the society of such jurists as Mr. Lawrence. As I belong to the committee which the Institute has appointed to study the kindred subject of 'The Three Rules,' I shall not be called upon to

²³ [Concerning the difference between legal and political claims in the affairs of Nations, see John Westlake, *International Law*, Cambridge University, 1904, Volume I., pages 289-293. Also the article by the same author on *International Arbitration* which appeared in the *International Journal of Ethics* for October, 1896, and which is reprinted in the volume above cited at pages 332-350.—T. W. B.]

express my opinion on this subject previous to the meeting, and I shall therefore mention to you now, in a very few words, what has occurred to me:—

“First: Arbitration being a contract by which the parties agree to abide by the decision of a third, is possible only between two parties, both of whom possess rational, and, as such, contracting will. This cuts off arbitration between civilized nations and barbarians, because barbarians are incapable of entering into such a contract. Civilized nations could not trust to the decision of the arbitrators whom barbarians might appoint; and even supposing them to appoint civilized men, civilized nations could not trust to their acceptance of the decision in which their own arbitrators had concurred. If the conduct of civilized nations to barbarians be unjust, it is a form of injustice which may be prevented—as in the case of the slave trade—by the condemnation and even by the intervention of other civilized nations; but it cannot be prevented by arbitration.

“Second: There are internal as well as external barbarians to whom these observations apply. Arbitration between the Commune of Paris, for example, and the Government of Versailles, would have been as much out of place as between us and

the Ashantees, or between a criminal and the public prosecutor.

“Third: Arbitration is inapplicable where the question at issue has reference to the relative value of States—where it is asked, for example, whether their historical position in relation to each other is or is not now their true position. So far as the Franco-German war was a fight for the hegemony of continental Europe, it did not admit of arbitration, for the very obvious reason that that was a question which, if it must be decided, could be decided only by trial of strength. On the other hand, in so far as the Franco-German war arose from the question whether France was entitled to the boundary of the Rhine, on geographical grounds, or whether Germany was entitled to Alsace and Lorraine on historical and ethnological grounds, it was a fit subject for arbitration, however difficult it might have been to induce either power to think so. It would, I believe, have been physically possible for Russia, England, America, and Austria combined, to have forced their services as mediators even upon two such formidable combatants as France and Germany, and perhaps they might now prevent the too probable recurrence of war. But even in the most improbable and incon-

ceivable event of their arbitration being accepted, by no decree arbitral could they have produced the facts that resulted from the late war, or could they now anticipate those which may result from another. Arbitration, like judicial action in any other form, can only declare a relation which already exists, whereas war brings about new relations, or at least converts those which existed *in posse* into relations *in esse*. On this ground I fear the Eastern Question too is beyond the reach of arbitration, that question, in its essence, being the question as to whether or not Russia be in reality the preponderating power, and, as such, entitled to give the law to the East of Europe and the West of Asia. Here, however, there is one element favorable to arbitration which did not exist in the case of France and Germany, namely, the willingness of one of the parties, at least (Turkey), to place herself unreservedly into the hands of neutrals. I refrain altogether from offering an opinion as to whether arbitration was, at any time, possible in the relations between the Northern and Southern States, previous to, or during the course of your own great civil war, that being a subject on which you are so much more able to form an opinion than I am.

"These three cases, or classes of cases, then, are the only ones I can think of at present that seem to forbid the hope of ever being dealt with by arbitration. They leap over all the ordinary disputes and disagreements of nations, which admit of being measured by pecuniary compensation, or arranged by the exchange or cession of territory, with a view to the rectification of boundary lines and the like. Even within these limits the action of courts composed of neutral arbiters may be extremely useful in removing more speedily and with less irritation than was possible by the arbitration of sovereigns or by ordinary diplomacy, causes which interrupted international cordiality, and in the end may have led to wars. But it is not out of questions such as these that great wars have generally arisen. I doubt whether you could mention a single war of any importance between two civilized nations that arose substantially out of such a question as the *Alabama* claims; and that question, too, would, in my opinion, have been settled without war even although it had not been settled by arbitration.²⁴ It is well that we have been spared the estrangement to which a trouble-

²⁴ It was, more likely, because the questions to be adjudicated came within the domain of "*le Droit International privé*" and not "*public*."

some course of negotiation, probably extending over years, must inevitably have led, and that we have escaped the still more fatal consequences in which such estrangement might have resulted. But it is well, too, that we should remember that, in our international just as in our municipal relations, arbitration being voluntary on both sides, must always be of the nature of a friendly suit; and that the first condition of its possibility is that one of the parties at all events shall have previously come to the conclusion that the question in dispute is not worth a war. In this case I suspect that a conclusion had been arrived at by both parties, and hence the success of the arbitration.

“Those who expect arbitration to become applicable to the graver disputes of nations are probably misled by the frivolous pretexts on which declarations of war are often made at the last—such, for example, as the Emperor not wishing to talk politics when he was drinking his waters, or after he had drunk them. But these are not the causes of war; deeper causes at least lie behind them, for which deeper remedies than arbitration must be found. We may hope that wars will diminish in frequency by the gradual action of a growing national reason, and the adoption of sounder

political principles, national and international, till at last, like duelling in this country, they cease altogether. But if they are to be averted directly, I am convinced that that can be done only by the help of some form of international organization which shall render it possible to bring the armed intervention of neutral nations to bear on them. I fear you will think me a pessimist in this matter. I know that such is the opinion of many of my sanguine friends in Europe, and even of some of my colleagues of the Institute. But I cannot affect a confidence which I do not feel; and I am wholly unable to discover grounds for expecting results from arbitration in international relations which it does not yield in municipal relations, and this more especially when I reflect how far municipal organization has advanced beyond international organization, and municipal law beyond international law. When I hear of a State of which the citizens have become so reasonable and dispassionate as to abolish compulsory jurisdiction and to trust to voluntary arbitration, I shall then begin to have higher hopes of international reason and moderation, and consequently of International Arbitration. I do not say that an international legislature, an international judicature, and an

international executive, after the manner I have elsewhere suggested, are aspirations capable of realization. Perhaps, as M. Rolin-Jaequemyns²⁵ maintains, they are remedies which might prove more dreadful than even the terrible malady they were intended to cure. But I do say that they are the only direct remedies for war, and that, apart from them, we must be contented to teach, to wait, and—to pray.

“Believe me, etc.,

“J. LORIMER.”²⁶

The foregoing remarks require no comment further than to express my hearty concurrence with nearly all of them. One point admits of an observation.

As to arbitration between the Northern and the

²⁵ Editor of *La Revue de Droit International*, Brussels.

²⁶ Professor Lorimer is best known on this side of the Atlantic by his treatise, *The Institutes of Law as determined by the Principles of Nature*, Edinburgh, 1872; but his *Constitutionalism of the Future* and his *Political Progress not necessarily Democratic*, are well worthy the consideration of American publicists.

[Professor Lorimer also wrote, *The Institutes of the Law of Nations: A Treatise of the Jural Relations of Separate Political Communities*, Edinburgh and London, 1883-84, and *Studies National and International*, Edinburgh, 1890.—T. W. B.]

Southern States before the breaking out of the civil war in America:—

(i.) The Constitution of the United States was framed expressly with a view to avoid and prevent any sort of hostile dispute between the constituent members of the Union. It is beyond the purposes of this pamphlet to enter into an elaborate examination of the functions and powers of the Supreme Court, or the complex, delicate machinery of co-ordinate executive, legislative, and judicial powers, by which it was thought that all questions, how grave soever, would be peaceably and satisfactorily solved. Without attempting to cite Kent or Story, or other learned jurists, it is quite sufficient, in order to show that it was so understood at the time, to refer to the debates in the Virginia Convention prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and especially to the adverse arguments of George Mason and the replies of James Madison.

(ii.) An extra-constitutional body or Peace Conference was in fact convened in Washington, composed of representatives from the different States. That its efforts proved abortive, and that the constitutional remedies for the alleged wrong of the South were not resorted to, were simply owing to the

fact, that from the first, it was intended by the leading Southern politicians to disregard them and reject all attempts at settlement. Both kinds of arbitration, that legally organized and prepared in advance, that which was advisory and voluntary, were summarily spurned, and there remained no other tribunal than that of force.

There are also other "signs of the times" which justify the advocates of International Arbitration in entertaining great hope for the future. Railways, ocean steamers, telegraphs and newspapers, have created a solidarity amongst nations, such as has not heretofore existed, too occult as yet for its force to be fully appreciated, but whose influences are visible like the early streaks of the dawn. Evangelical alliances, international meetings for scientific purposes, congresses to consider the treatment of criminals, the international law associations which are soon to assemble in Geneva, and various other societies, testify to the growth

of this feeling. The advanced education of the working classes has provoked and fostered a spirit of inquiry amongst them, and they too have their international gatherings, where, amongst other things, they ask why wars in which they are slaughtered by thousands should be wantonly undertaken?²⁷ The Congress lately convened at Brussels may be referred to as an evidence that governments also commence to recognize this tendency towards community amongst nations. It is true that the United States were not represented, that England and France sent delegates fettered by instructions, that Austria sent memoranda from her war department as well as from her foreign office, and that other powers maintained a guarded reserve. The conferences of that Congress may prove sterile from many causes, not the least of which are the difficulties inherent in the very nature of the subjects which they propose to regulate by codes. *La Société Française des amis de la Paix*,²⁸ protested with great severity against articles III. and IV., as "awakening indignation and

²⁷ "Pourquoi nous égorger? Ne vaut-il pas mieux aimer? Les peuples sont des frères."

²⁸ *Courier des États-Unis*, August 11th, 1874. "Un Congrès de Dissidents."

horror in the breast of every honest man." The course of the Swiss, Spanish, Dutch, Austrian, Swedish, and Belgian delegates during the debates clearly evinces the doubtful practicability of giving those articles an efficient or satisfactory action, should they be ever accepted. The outcry of the French as to the conduct of the Germans at Weissenbourg, at Bazincourt, at Ablis, at Etrépagny and other places was loud at the time and has never ceased.²⁹ The Germans responded by solemn declarations that the so-called victims were individual adventurers, unorganized forces, and in these or in other ways amenable to the utmost rigors of the laws of war. In the matter of requisitions, the German history of the Franco-German war, prepared with the most elaborate care by the Prussian staff,³⁰ asserts that all the pains possible were taken to carry out in an orderly manner the proclamation of the King (August 8th), yet such were the obstacles, so serious the embarrassments,

²⁹ The latest French history of the war of 1870-71, by A. Wachter, Paris, 1874, has at page 152 a large wood cut, entitled "Massacre des blessés dans des fermes converties en ambulances. Épisode de Wissembourg."

³⁰ *La Guerre Franco-Allemande de 1870-71*.—Translation of Major Costa de Serda, Berlin, 1873-4, i., 422, 423

so numerous the infractions, that "it required the most energetic intervention of the superior officers to prevent disorder from spreading like a contagion"—an experience not peculiar to that war, as may be seen from the nature and incidents of some of the claims presented to, and passed upon by, the Mixed Commission already referred to as organized under the Treaty of Washington. Much practical good can scarcely be expected therefore from the deliberation of the Congress touching such subjects. It furnishes, nevertheless, an element of hope in that the world has beheld a body of authorized delegates who have discussed in a common tongue some momentous questions, and cited Puffendorf, Vattel, Ortolan, and other authorities in support of their views. But above all, it is a proof that Governments as well as Peoples recognize the idea of a common humanity, that this idea exhibits vitality and an aggressive strength, that it exacts respect from the former, and will sooner or later respond to the aspirations and satisfy the needs of the latter.

NEWPORT, RHODE ISLAND, September 8th, 1874.

APPENDIX.

I.

Letter from George H. Yeaman, American Minister to Denmark, to Thomas Balch.—T. W. B.³¹

“LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,

“COPENHAGEN, 26 March, 1867.

“DEAR SIR:—I have read with much interest your letter of the 13 May, 1865, to the Editor of New York *Tribune*, and now republished in the *Social Science* for this month, which you have kindly sent me. In that letter you propound what seems to you the best method of amicably settling the pending controversies between the United States and Great Britain.

“Omitting all discussion of the propriety and feasibility of now referring the matters in dispute to arbitration, the mode you advocate, I only desire to express my decided approbation of your

³¹ [George Helm Yeaman, was born in Hardin County, Kentucky, November 1st, 1829. He was judge of Daviess County, Kentucky, member of Congress, 1862–1865, and American Minister to Denmark, 1865–1870. After that he practised at the New York Bar. He wrote on *Naturalization*, *Privateering*, &c. Mr. Yeaman died in 1908.—T. W. B.]

suggestion as to the mode of selecting and organizing tribunals of arbitration, in cases where the powers interested agree to a reference. That the tribunal or arbiter shall not be the executive head of a government, but a small number of jurists of acknowledged character and learning.

"I have never believed in the durability and efficacy of any of the schemes for an international tribunal to settle all disputes and prevent all wars. Whether it is well or unfortunate, it is quite clear that in the present stage of the development and practice of political science, there can be no reference but by agreement, and the agreement must be had in each case as it arises, and the tribunal or arbiter must be selected for the occasion.

"While this remains the only practicable mode of securing the benefits of a reference, every sound reason is against the ordinary plan of selecting a crowned, or other executive, head of a government, and sustains the plan of selecting a tribunal composed of those who make the understanding and the elucidation of law, in its largest sense as the science of justice, the study of their lives.

"It is no disparagement of those generally found at the heads of the executive governments of the civilized world, to say that they are not generally

those best acquainted with jurisprudence; and that every government, of whatever form, nearly always contains within its limits, a number of jurists more learned in their profession, and better qualified by their habits of thought, to conduct such an investigation than the executive head of that government. Neither is it any impeachment of their probity or their desire to render a just judgment to say that executive rulers, are, from their position, more apt to be influenced by motives of policy, or of personal or political partiality; than a Court of international jurists would be, while some, who might render real service in that capacity, would occasionally decline to act on account of the delicate embarrassment in which any action might involve them. And those who consent to act, no doubt, often refer the case, for investigation and advice, to a subject of their own selection, one unknown to the parties, at least not agreed upon by them; and, though the award may come formally as from the crown, it is really the opinion of some person not embraced in the reference and who neither incurs blame nor makes reputation by his judgment. Thus the parties are put in the position of abiding by the award of one selected for them by another; they know not

what influenced the selection, and however learned the adviser may be, the parties have not had the advantages of a consultation and comparison of views. These objections manifestly do not apply to the case of an umpire selected in advance by referees in view of the possibility of their own disagreement.

“Thus the advantages of learning and of freedom from all improper influences are on the side of a select committee or board of jurists. From their breasts selfishness, jealousy, partiality and refined policy, as applied to the matter before them, are all excluded. They work out their conclusions in the light of usage, precedent, right reason, natural right, *science*. What of ambition they may have is constrained to be innocent and laudable, for it can only be gratified by building a reputation, which, in their vocation, can have no other foundation than justice and truth. The judgments of such tribunals would be sought for and recognized as the highest evidence of what the law is, and they would develop, polish, and make symmetrical, the law of nations, as the judgments of Hardwick, Eldon and Mansfield have done the law of England, and as the judgments of Kent, Marshall and Story have done the law in the United States.

"I have been much impressed with your observation that this 'would be no trifling event in the march of Democratic Freedom.' It would accelerate and illustrate the progress of democratic freedom, a freedom that is far more secure against license than any scheme of personal government or irresponsible power can be, because it would be a tribute to the domination of mind, intelligence, reason, science, over accident, force and tradition in the affairs of men. The struggle for that domination is the beginning, and its full consummation is the highest and fairest fruit of democracy. If that element in government has been the most rare and the least successful, it is because that, while appearing to be the most simple, it is really the most difficult, and it is the most difficult because the conditions of its success are the highest and the least frequent among men.

"Very Respectfully,

"Your Obedient Servant,

"GEO. H. YEAMAN.

"THOMAS BALCH, ESQ.,

"PARIS."

II.

The following article was part of a letter written at Paris on October the 31st, 1874, to the *Philadelphia North American and United States Gazette*, and published in that paper on November the 14th. I am inclined to think that the author was Mr. W. H. Huntington (see page 12), for many years the Paris correspondent of the *New York Tribune*. —T. W. B.

“The pamphlet of your fellow-townsmen, Mr. Thomas Balch, on ‘International Courts of Arbitration,’ dated from Newport, Rhode Island, and for a copy of which I have to thank the author, has attracted much and deserved attention here, both from his own countrymen and others. In the first place, the pamphlet is acknowledged to be only a fair indication of the author’s claims to be considered, in the words of the article quoted by him from the *New York Tribune* of April last, as ‘the original recommender of almost precisely the plan of arbitration in the *Alabama* case, which was finally adopted and carried out to a conclusion at

Geneva;’ or in the still more forcible language of his learned correspondent, Professor Lorimer, of Edinburgh, as ‘the very remarkable anticipator (by his letter of March, 1865 [published in the New York *Tribune*, on May 13th, 1865], that is addressed to the above-named journal) of the Treaty which was negotiated six years afterwards.’ Such testimony paid to the real service rendered by Mr. Balch, both to his own country and the world at large, though coming late, must be extremely welcome, and will certainly take by surprise not a few even of those who may have hitherto thought themselves most fully acquainted with all the circumstances of that long controversy. At least such has been the impression left by its pages upon many here, both American and French, whose attention I have drawn to Mr. Balch’s publication.

“But the pamphlet will be useful, and I am sure its author will be glad to think and intended that it should be so in other respects, as well as vindicating his own just rights and merits. Its excellent tone will tend, I trust, to clear any dregs of bitterness which may still cloud the good feelings which ought to exist between the kindred nations—nations who ought to understand more and more, since late events and in the present chaotic state of Europe,

that they are the only two peoples between whom something far nearer and closer than any mere political alliance is possible, an alliance that is based on social, religious, family, literary, historical and a thousand other mutual associations, and all whose public and private institutions, however they may seem to differ occasionally in form, are in reality akin, and wear and ever must wear a strong family resemblance. And with this view I am glad to see that Mr. Balch quotes the words of Mr. Cobden, to the effect that, while admitting grievances, America had 'more cause, on the whole, to be grateful to the British Government for what it refused to do, than angry with it for what it did,' or, he might have added, sometimes neglected to do. I heard nearly the same sentiment from the lips of the lamented Mr. Dayton³² here in Paris, at the very crisis of the war; and none knew or were made to feel more deeply or painfully than he what the British Government had 'refused to do,' and by whom it had been asked so to do. It is

³² [At that time our Minister to France. In reference to the Mexican expedition, see *Commentaire sur les Éléments du Droit International et sur l'Histoire des progrès du Droit des Gens de Henry Wheaton. Précédé d'une notice sur la carrière diplomatique de M. Wheaton* par William Beach Lawrence. F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, 1869, Volume II., pages 339-387, *passim*.—T. W. B.]

essential that the American people should understand that the attempts to injure them in England proceeded only from a party and a clique (such as will exist in all countries under similar circumstances), and not from the country itself at large, or its government; just as Mr. Balch so truly says, that the abuses uttered against America in the British Parliament proceeded from 'gentlemen who form a class apart' and 'whose political creed is to believe and say unseemly things of republican institutions.' But no man in his senses can now believe that such are the feelings of the British nation in general.

"But, above all, Mr. Balch's publication is valuable as keeping still before the world, at a moment when 'nation is literally rising against nation,' and when universal and obligatory personal service in France is being met by counter demonstrations of the *landsturm* in Germany, of keeping before the eyes of the world the fact that 'this mode of settling disputes has been fully and successfully tried' by two of the not least powerful and warlike nationalities of the world. It is useful also as freeing the movement in favor of arbitration from the merely Utopian and extravagant ideas of the peacemakers, the champions of *la paix à tout prix*,

which served only (as they did in 1849-50, with Victor Hugo at their head) to turn the whole thing into ridicule.

* * * * *

“Professor Lorimer’s letter of February last and Mr. Balch’s comment upon it, show not that wars can ever become impossible, but how far and where arbitrations may be rendered always possible. And in doing this both writers confer a just boon upon their own generation and on posterity.”

III.

This letter of Monsieur Henry Moreau, addressed to the author of this monograph, is written in English. He was a distinguished member of the Paris Bar, a member of the *Société de Législation Comparée*, and the author of *La Politique Française en Amérique, 1861-1864*, (Paris 1864). —T. W. B.

“PARIS, 9 Oct., 1874.

“370 rue St. Honoré.

“MY DEAR BALCH:—Many thanks for your kind souvenir. I perused with the greatest interest and satisfaction your remarkable pamphlet on *International Courts of Arbitration*, and found you have given full evidence of your *paternal right* on this service which ended so happily both for America and England, the quarrels springing from the *Alabama* matter and the San Juan Boundaries. I thank you also for having mentioned my name in such an honorable company, with the publicists who have illustrated the dark points of International Law.

* * * * *

“HENRY MOREAU,

“*Avocat a la cour d'Appel.*”

IV.

Letter from Professor John Westlake to the editor upon receiving a copy of an earlier edition of this book.—T. W. B.

“3 CHELSEA EMBANKMENT, LONDON, S. W.,
“17 APRIL, 1896.

“DEAR SIR:—I am much obliged to you for sending me your reprint of your father’s article on *International Courts of Arbitration*. I am glad to see his letter of 31 March, 1865, and Professor Lorimer’s of February, 1874, reproduced in what we may hope will be a permanent form. They both deserve permanence, and the *Law Magazine and Review* could hardly give it to them. I may remark, by the way, with regard to the mention of my name on [p. 16] that I was not *editor* of *Social Science*, but, as an officer of the now defunct Social Science Association, I was able to get Mr. Balch’s letter inserted in the little publication, which belonged to the Association. At that time I had studied public international law but little, though I was already known as a writer on private international law. I have since studied the public branch much, and am now professor of it

at Cambridge, though resident most of the year in London, which is always my best address. And I look back with great respect on your father and all others who took a prominent part in bringing about the Alabama Arbitration. I am hopeless of good results from *general* treaties for arbitration, never having seen, or been able to devise, any formula that can distinguish with sufficient precision the cases in which it is an applicable remedy from those in which it could not be submitted to. We may say that it is suitable for cases of a *legal* character, not for those of a *political* one. And that distinction is probably intelligible enough for practical purposes, though not precise enough for a treaty. The good cause is one which must progress by the force of accumulated examples, and, since it cannot progress otherwise, all the more important is the duty of setting example wherever possible, and all the greater the merit of those who, like your father, have been pioneers in setting the most conspicuous examples. Wherever the legal element is the only one in a case, as it was in the Alabama dispute, I agree with your father in thinking that a Court composed of private jurists is preferable to arbitration by a crowned (or other) head of a state. There are, however, cases in which a *full* solution can

hardly be reached on legal grounds. Such, in my view, is the present (1896) boundary dispute between England and Venezuela. I believe that no jurists would hesitate to award to each country the districts which its people have occupied, but that this would leave between the occupied districts a tract across which law could fail to find the means of drawing a line. In a case of that description the services of a *mediator*, who can *recommend* a line for adoption, while an arbitrator can only say, 'this *is* the line,' seem to be required. And I made a suggestion of that nature for the settlement of the Venezuela dispute, in the London *Times* of 6th January last.

"Believe me to be yours ever faithfully,

"J. WESTLAKE.

"Thomas Willing Balch, Esq."

V.

Letter of the Rev. Dr. Edward Everett Hale, for many years one of the prominent citizens of Boston, and the author of "The United States of Europe," 1871, to the editor.—T. W. B.

"*The Peace Crusade*,"

"*"A Permanent Tribunal."*

"LEND-A-HAND OFFICE,

"14 BEDFORD STREET,

"BOSTON, April 21, 1899.

"MY DEAR MR. BALCH:—I take the liberty to address you, to ask if your Philadelphia Committee have sent to our five delegates to The Hague your father's valuable paper on international courts. If they have not, we will.

"Truly yours,

"EDWARD E. HALE."

Five copies of the 1899 edition were at once sent to Dr. Hale, who sent them to the United States delegates at The Hague.

VI.

Letter of Henry Flanders of the Philadelphia Bar to the editor of this reprint. Mr. Flanders was the author of *Lives and Times of the Chief Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States* (Philadelphia, 1881).—T. W. B.

“PHILADELPHIA, 419 WALNUT STREET,

“APRIL 5th, 1910.

“*Thomas Willing Balch, Esquire, 1412 Spruce Street.*

“DEAR MR. BALCH:—Referring to our conversation of the 13th inst. [March] at the Historical Society, I beg to say, that I recall your father's visit to Philadelphia, when he came over from Paris, at the close of our Civil War.

“At that time there was a great deal of irritation in the public mind, over the unneutral conduct of the British Government, during the progress of that war. Your father was deeply concerned at the state of our relations with Great Britain, and extremely solicitous to avoid a clash of arms between the two countries. How this could be done, seemed to be the engrossing subject of his thoughts.

"He told me of his visit to President Lincoln, the details of which I have forgotten. I distinctly recall, however, that the President could not be persuaded that your father's scheme of arbitration was practicable. That it did finally prevail; that it has in some sort, well-nigh become a principle of international law, should redound to his credit and esteem among mankind. He was, indeed, a pioneer in a comparatively untrodden field, and as such is entitled to present and future praise.

"Believe me to be

"Yours very cordially,

"HENRY FLANDERS."

VII.

The Honorable Frank Warren Hackett, of the District of Columbia Bar, author of the following letter, was private secretary of Caleb Cushing, the senior counsel of the United States for the trial of the *Alabama* Claims case before the Geneva Tribunal. Mr. Hackett was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy during the Presidency of Mr. McKinley, in which office he served from April, 1900, to December, 1901. In 1912-13 he was President of the New Hampshire Historical Society. He published in 1911: *Reminiscences of the Geneva Tribunal of Arbitration, 1872: The Alabama Claims*. —T. W. B.

“WASHINGTON, D. C.

“MAY 10, 1915.

“MY DEAR MR. BALCH:—It is indeed a happy task to which you are applying yourself. I can conceive of few occupations more grateful than that of presenting with a filial hand the record of work done for the benefit of his country

June 3d 94

My dear friend.

Dear Sir:

I have just sent
you a copy of my
book on "The
International Court,"
originally written in
1874. Pray look at the
account of the inter-
view with Lincoln
and the post-words.
Then the Germans are

defeated, the work will
be of use.

Yours truly
Theobald

To Sir Robert Alexander Falconer
Toronto

and of the world by one's father. I am glad to learn that you are perfecting your former labor of putting into permanent shape a memorial volume that deals with the initial steps taken by your honored father in the cause of international arbitration.

"Future generations will look back with profound interest at the origin of the Tribunal at Geneva, that, in 1872, disposed of the *Alabama* Claims, and thereby strengthened the bond of friendship between England and the United States. Let not, however, too much be expected of an application of the principle to advance the cause of arbitration between nations in days to come. A study of the successive steps which culminated in the result at Geneva will disclose the existence of not a few perils that are to be met in an attempt to put into operation even the best conceived plan for international arbitration. Chief among these perils is the influence of the newspaper press, in either country, in inflaming the passions of the people, none too well informed as to the true nature of the subject in dispute. Yet I would not be misunderstood. We have reason to expect that in the process of time almost every possible controversy arising between two countries that shall not be

ended by negotiation, will, in conformity with a policy of state obtaining throughout the world, be referred to arbitration.

"I cannot forbear to remind you of the splendid work done by our Agent, John Chandler Bancroft Davis. It was he, who, at a most critical moment—heartily supported as he was by Lord Tenterden—displayed a firmness and a tact which carried us safely through a storm that was threatening to bring the whole business to an abrupt and disastrous end. Mr. Davis' conduct of our case was a signal triumph of the highest kind of diplomacy.

"It was a comparatively easy task for our counsel to prepare their argument. But the saving of the Treaty from disruption exhibited a higher order of intellectual achievement. I have with proper emphasis testified elsewhere to the service rendered by our Agent to his country at that trying period.

"You need no assurance that every incident connected with the *Alabama* Claims Arbitration possesses for me a peculiar interest. Not the least worthy of remembrance is the fact that Mr. Balch advanced in a form that has entitled him to wear the honors of a pioneer, the proposal to arbitrate.

His act was one destined to mark a departure in the conduct of nations. You deserve the thanks of the lover of American history for putting upon record betimes the story of this important step in the annals of international arbitration.

“With kind regards, I remain,

“Truly yours,

“FRANK WARREN HACKETT.”

“THOMAS WILLING BALCH, ESQR.,

“PHILADELPHIA, PA.”

INDEX.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Alabama Claims.....	v, vi, viii, ix, xi, xii, xiii, xiv, xviii, xix, xxii 32, 39, 61, 63, 68, 69, 70
<i>Alabama</i> , The.....	vii, xii, 3, 5, 12, 17, 28, 30, 39, 51, 56, 61
Arbitration, Court of International....	9, 10, 13, 14, 24, 26, 27, 32 33, 51, 57
Arbitrator, an.....	64
Asser, T. M. C.....	16
Balch, Rev. Dr. Stephen Bloomer.....	xv
Balch, Thomas.....	v, vi, viii, ix, x, xi, xii, xiii, xiv, xv, xvi, xvii xviii, xix, xxii, xxiii, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22 28, 51, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 70
Banks, General.....	10
Beall, Colonel Ninian.....	xv
Beck, James M.....	ix
Belligerents.....	5
Beust, von.....	5
Bismarck, von.....	5
Blankenburg, Rudolph.....	xxi, xxii
Bluntschli, J. C.....	18
Brooke, Colonel Thomas, Acting Governor of Maryland 1720....	xvi
Brooke, Robert, Acting Governor of Maryland 1652.....	xvi
Brussels, Congress of, in 1874.....	45
Cassini, Count, Russian Ambassador in Washington.....	viii
<i>Circassian</i> , The.....	25
Cobden, Richard.....	xviii, 8, 10, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 58
Columbia College (University).....	xvi
Corti, Count.....	vi, 25
Cushing, Caleb.....	68
<i>Cynée, Le Nouveau</i> , d' Émeric Crucé.....	8
Davis, John Chandler Bancroft.....	70

	PAGE
Declaration of Paris.....	7
Edmonds, Franklin Spencer.....	xi
English Government.....	xii, xiii, 1, 2, 13, 14, 19, 23, 25, 51, 66, 69
<i>Evening Bulletin</i> , Philadelphia.....	xii
Fauchille, Paul.....	xiii
Field, David Dudley.....	17
Flanders, Henry.....	66, 67
Forster, Sir Thomas, Judge of the Common Pleas, 1607-1612....	xvi
<i>Français en Amérique, Les</i>	xviii
<i>France Nouvelle, La</i>	11
Franklin.....	xii
Geneva Tribunal.....	vi, ix, x, xii, xiv, xv, 11, 12, 13, 19, 24, 28, 32 33, 34, 52, 57, 68, 69
Gortschakoff.....	4, 5
Gray, George.....	xxii
Greeley, Horace.....	10
Grotius.....	26
<i>Ground Arms</i>	ix
Hackett, Frank Warren.....	19, 68, 70, 71
Hague Peace Conference, First.....	vii, viii, 65
Hale, Rev. Dr. Edward Everett.....	viii, 65
Heffter, A. W.....	vii
Hewitt, Abram S.....	xvii
Hobbs's <i>Leviathan</i>	9
Holland, Thomas Erskine.....	vi
Holt, Hamilton.....	xxi
Holtzendorff.....	18
Hull, William I.....	xiv
Huntington, W. H.....	v, xviii, 11, 12, 21, 24, 56
International Courts of Justice.....	v, vi, vii, viii, xi, xiv, xix, xx xxii, 9, 10, 13, 25, 26, 27, 34, 39, 44, 52, 53, 54, 61, 62, 63
International Law.....	vii, 18, 26, 27
International Law Association.....	vi
International Tribunals (see International Courts).	

	PAGE
Kapp, Friederich	18
Kern, J. C.	15, 18
Laboulaye, Edouard.....	18
<i>Law Magazine and Review</i>	vi, 62
Lawrence, William Beach.....	vi, 6, 34, 35, 58
Legal cases.....	63
Lincoln, President.....	x, xv, xviii, xxii, 2, 9, 10, 21, 23, 67
L'Institut de Droit International.....	vii, 11, 16, 31, 35, 41
<i>Locksley Hall</i>	26
Lorimer, James.....	vi, vii, ix, 11, 27, 28, 29, 31, 42, 57, 60, 62
Louter, J. de.....	8
Lowell, A. Lawrence.....	xxii
McMaster, John Bach.....	xix
Mediation, Board of.....	xix, xx
Mediator, a.....	64
Mexican Expedition.....	4, 11, 23, 58
Mill, John Stuart.....	17
Moore, John Bassett.....	xix, xx, 8
Moreau, Henry.....	18, 61
Napoleon the Third.....	2, 3
Neutrals.....	5, 33, 34, 62
Neutrality.....	5, 7
New Hampshire Historical Society.....	68
<i>North American</i> , Philadelphia.....	56
Northcote, Sir Stafford.....	vi, 17
Nys, Ernest.....	xii, 8
Oppenheim, Lassa.....	xiv, xv, 9
Ortolan, Théodore.....	47
Pauncefote, Sir Julian, British Ambassador at Washington and leading British Delegate at the First Hague Peace Conference	viii
Penn.....	xii, xxii
Pennsylvania, Historical Society of.....	xvii, 66
Perrine, William.....	xii
Political cases.....	63

	PAGE
Pollock, Sir Frederick, Bart.....	9
Prévost-Paradol.....	11
Princeton University.....	xv, xviii
Prussian Supreme Court.....	vii, 19
Puffendorf, Samuel.....	47
Reid, Whitelaw.....	27, 28
<i>Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée</i>	16, 17, 42
Rodeffer, J. D.....	xi
Rolin-Jaequemyns, G.....	16, 42
Russia and the American Civil War.....	4
San Juan Boundary.....	30, 61
"Shippen Papers".....	xviii
<i>Social Science</i>	v, xix, 16, 17, 51, 62
Social Science Association.....	v, 17
Société de Législation Comparée, La.....	xviii, 18, 61
Straus, Oscar S.....	xxii
Taft, ex-President.....	xxi, xxii
Taney, Roger Brooke, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.....	xvii
Tenderden, Lord.....	70
Three Rules, The.....	19, 35
<i>Tribune</i> , New York.....	v, x, xiii, xviii, xix, 10, 11, 21, 22, 27, 28, 31, 51, 56
Treaties, General, of Arbitration.....	63
United States.....	x, xii, xiii, xix, 2, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 19, 25, 51, 69
Vattel, E. de.....	47
Venezuela arbitration case.....	64
Virginia Historical Society.....	xviii
Washington, Treaty of, 1871.....	vi, 6, 19, 31, 32, 47
Welsh, Herbert.....	x
Westlake, John.....	vi, vii, xx, xxi, 8, 16, 17, 35, 62, 64
White, Andrew Dickinson.....	vii
Yeaman, George Helm.....	51, 55
Zuinglius.....	26

BINDING SECT. MAY 15 1974

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
